

Remarks

[0001] Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" refers to the non-final Office Action dated March 9, 2007.

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 24-28, 31, 32, and 87-100 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 24-28, 31, 32, 87, and 94. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are none. New claims added herein are none. No new matter has been added herein.

[0003] Applicant notes that each of the pending claims were previously indicated as allowed over the then cited art, subject to incorporating amendments which were agreed to during a telephone interview on 11/20/2006 (Notice of Allowance, dated 11/26/2006). Subsequent to the Notice of Allowance, the claims were rejected based upon a new ground(s) of rejection (*Office Action*, p.2). The claims herein include amendments which were previously agreed to during the telephone interview and new amendments which further distinguish over the newly cited art.

Formal Matters

[0004] The Office objects to claims 24, 87, and 94 because of the following informalities: The phrase "context previous to" should be written as "context previous". Applicant amends these claims, as shown above, to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Substantive Claim Rejections

35 USC § 103 Claim Rejections

[0005] Claims 24-28, 31-32, and 87-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,968,940 to Liddy et al. (hereinafter, "Liddy") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229537 to Dunning et al. (hereinafter, "Dunning") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,202 to Schuetze et al. (hereinafter, "Schuetze") (*Office Action*, p. 2).

[0006] Claims 26, 89, and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Liddy in view of Dunning in view of Schuetze and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,942 to Talati et al. (hereinafter, "Talati") (*Office Action*, p. 6).

[0007] Claims 27, 90, and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Liddy in view of Dunning in view of Schuetze and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,552 to Blabanovic et al. (hereinafter, "Blabanovic") (*Office Action*, p. 7).

[0008] Claims 31, 92, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Liddy in view of Dunning in view of Schuetze and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,539 to Conrad et al. (hereinafter, "Conrad") (*Office Action*, p. 8).

[0009] Claims 32, 93, and 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Liddy in view of Dunning in view of Schuetze and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,908 to Chong et al. (hereinafter, "Chong") (*Office Action*, p. 9).

[0010] Applicant respectfully traverses each of the §103 rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance in light of the comments and amendments contained herein. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed along to issuance.

[0011] **Claim 24** recites a tangible computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-executable instructions for:

detecting user input corresponding to a present user context; and

responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicit query:

analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user preferences modeling, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the user, the user preferences modeling containing user log records clustered into several preferences clusters based on clusters semantic similarity, each cluster of the clusters represented by a keyword frequency vector, the analyzing further comprising evaluating the user input based on lexical and syntactical features;

predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;

retrieving information corresponding to the one or more media files from a media content source, wherein the retrieved information was generated in response to

a user context previous and different from the present user context;

displaying the retrieved information as a suggestion to a user

evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and

displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user.

[0012] Liddy and/or Dunning and/or Schuetze do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 24. For example, the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination does not teach or suggest, "evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user" and as recited in claim 24.

[0013] Liddy describes techniques for generating representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural language processing (NLP) techniques (Liddy, Abstract). However, Liddy says nothing about evaluating user input using linguistic features and user intention modeling to predict a user's next action (*e.g.*, user plans to insert a photo in a document). More specifically, Liddy does not teach or suggest "evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user;

and displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user” and as recited in claim 24.

[0014] Dunning describes a system for discovering relationships among items such as music tracks, and then making recommendations for other music tracks based on user preferences and the discovered relationships (Dunning, [0003]). The Office cites to Dunning as teaching that electronic commerce sites are able to suggest products that are likely to be of interest to particular users, based on user profiles and user preferences (*Office Action*, p.4; *Dunning* [0005] and [0044]).

[0015] However, Dunning does not cure the deficiencies of Liddy, as Dunning says nothing about evaluating user input using linguistic features and user intention modeling to predict a user’s next action. More specifically, Dunning does not teach or suggest “evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user” and as recited in claim 24.

[0016] Schuetze describes a system for representing users in a user population, qualitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents, where each cluster is represented as a vector (*Office Action*, p.4; *Schuetze*, Abstract).

[0017] However, Schuetze does not cure the deficiencies of Liddy and/or Dunning, as Schuetze says nothing about evaluating user input using linguistic features and user intention modeling to predict a user's next action. More specifically, Schuetze does not teach or suggest "evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user" and as recited in claim 24.

[0018] Further, even if the cited references disclosed all of this claim's recited features, which they do not, the Office has nonetheless failed to provide a sufficient motivation to combine Schuetze with Dunning. Applicant contends that a person of ordinary skill in that art would not have attempted the combination put forth by the Office, and that the rejection at least in part constitutes nothing more than hindsight, utilizing Applicant's application as a road map for the rejection which the Office makes. However, the impermissible use of hindsight is contrary to established law. For example:

The invention must be viewed not after the blueprint has been drawn by the inventor, but as it would have been perceived in the state of the art that existed at the time the invention was made. (*Sensonics Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.*, Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit 81 F.3d 1566; 38 USPQ2d (BNA) 1551).

[0019] Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

[0020] **Claims 25 and 28** are allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination by virtue of their dependency upon claim 24 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, one or both of claims 25 and 28 may also be allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze for independent reasons.

[0021] Claim 87 recites a computer-implemented method, comprising:

detecting user input corresponding to a present user context; and

responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicit query:

analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user preferences modeling, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the user, the user preferences modeling containing user log records clustered into several preferences clusters based on clusters semantic similarity, each cluster of the clusters represented by a keyword frequency vector, the analyzing further comprising evaluating the user input based on lexical and syntactical features;

predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;

retrieving information corresponding to the one or more media files from a media content source based on the analysis, wherein the retrieved information was generated in response to a user context previous and different from the present user context;

displaying the retrieved information as a suggestion to a user;

evaluating at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and

displaying an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user.

[0022] In rejecting claim 87, the Office indicates that the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 24 (*Office Action* p. 5). In response, Applicant asserts that amended claim 87 allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claim 24. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated the arguments.

[0023] Accordingly, claim 87 is allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

[0024] **Claims 88 and 91** are allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination by virtue of their dependency upon claim 87 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, one or both of claims 88 and 91 may also be allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze for independent reasons.

[0025] **Claim 94** recites a system comprising at least one processor and a tangible computer-accessible storage medium coupled to the at least one processor, the system configured to:

detect user input corresponding to a present user context; and

responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicit query:

analyze at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user preferences modeling, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the user, the user preferences modeling containing user log records clustered into several preferences clusters based on clusters semantic similarity, each cluster of the clusters represented by a keyword frequency vector, the analyzing further comprising evaluating the user input based on lexical and syntactical features;

predict desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;

retrieve information corresponding to the one or more media files from a media content source based on the analysis, wherein the retrieved information was generated in response to a user context previous and different from the present user context;

display the retrieved information as a suggestion to a user;

evaluate at least a subset of the user input in view of linguistic features and user intention modeling, the user intention modeling using the linguistic features of the user input to predict a next action of the user; and

display an option to execute the next action as a suggestion to the user.

[0026] In rejecting claim 94, the Office indicates that the claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 24 (*Office Action* p. 5). In response, Applicant asserts that amended claim 87 allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claim 24. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated the arguments.

[0027] Accordingly, claim 94 is allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

[0028] **Claims 95 and 98** are allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination by virtue of their dependency upon claim 94 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, one or both of claims 95 and 98 may also be allowable over the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze for independent reasons.

Dependent Claims

[0029] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant submits that the Office withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

[0030] **Claims 26, 27, 31, 32, 89, 90, 92, 93, 96, 97 99, and 100:** Applicant notes that none of these claims are independent claims,

and that each of these claims ultimately depends from one of independent base claims 24, 87, and 94. Applicant further notes that Talatie and/or Balabanovic and/or Conrad and/or Chang do not cure the deficiencies of the Liddy-Dunning-Schuetze combination as discussed above in response to the rejection of the respective base claims.

[0031] It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable, and therefore Applicant does not believe that it is necessary to present arguments in favor of each and every one of these dependent claims, as such claims should be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for their own recited features which are neither shown nor supported in the cited art.

Conclusion

[0032] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6-28-2007

By: 
Christen M. Fairborn
Reg. No. 55,164
(509) 324-9256 x249
chrisf@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com